

**REMARKS**

The rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 has been obviated by amending this claim to depend from claim 1, instead of claim 11. Similarly, claim 26 has been amended to depend from claim 19, thereby laying an antecedent basis for “said ultraviolet radiation.”

The § 112 rejection of claim 14 has been obviated by revising this claim to respond to the Examiner’s objections thereto. The rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 has similarly been obviated by revising this claim to render it more clear and concise. Claim 17 has been cancelled, thereby mooting all issues under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2.

The rejection of claims 1-6, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) and 103 has been obviated by revising independent claim to incorporate the limitations of objected-to claim 12.

Claim 2 has been cancelled, as the limitation contained therein has been incorporated into claim 1.

Claims 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 are patentable by virtue of their dependency on amended claim 1.

Claim 12 has been cancelled, since the limitation contained therein has been incorporated into claim 1.

Claim 13 is likewise patentable for its dependency upon amended claim 1.

Claim 14 has been rewritten to render it similar but somewhat broader in scope than amended claim 1. In particular, the inclusion of the step of “writing a grating on said optical fiber by exposing said fiber to ultraviolet radiation. . .” renders this claim patentable over the combination of the Beales ‘754 and Antos ‘679 patents, as neither of these patents disclose or suggests such a writing step.

Claim 15 has been cancelled since the limitation contained therein has been incorporated into amended claim 14.

Claim 16 is patentable at least by reason of its dependency upon claim 14.

Claim 17 has been cancelled. Accordingly, no discussion of this claim is deemed necessary.

Claim 18 is patentable at least by reason of its dependency on claim 14.

Claim 19 has been amended to include the limitation of objected-to claim 25. Accordingly, claim 19 is patentable.

Claims 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24 are each patentable at least by reason of their dependency upon claim 19.

Claim 25 has been cancelled since the limitation contained therein has been incorporated into claim 19.

Finally, claim 26 is patentable at least by reason of its dependency upon claim 19.

New claim 27 is similar in scope to amended claim 1, the only difference being that this claim recites a broader temperature range. However, as the grating writing step recited in this claim is neither disclosed or suggested by any of the references of record, claim 27 is patentable for the same reason as claim 1.


New claim 28 is substantially the same scope as objected-to claim 7, the only difference being that the temperature range recited is broader. However, as the prior art neither discloses or suggests the recited temperature range or the step of doping the optical fiber along a core portion, new claim 28 is patentable.

New claim 29 is patentable for its recitation of a step of drawing optical fiber at a tension of between about 100 gms and 250 gms in combination with a step of writing a grating on the resulting optical fiber by exposing the fiber to ultraviolet radiation. None of the references of record discloses or suggests such a combination of steps.

Finally, new claim 30 is patentable for its recitation of the steps of drawing a fiber from a molten layer "at a temperature of under 225°C. . ." at a tension between about 100 gms and 250 gms, in combination with the step of "doping said optical fiber along the core portion . . ." Accordingly, new claim 30 is patentable for substantially the same reasons that objected-to claim 7 is patentable.

Now that all the claims are believed to be patentable, the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance is hereby respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas W. Cole

Registration No. 28,290

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
401 Ninth Street, N.W.  
Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20004  
(202) 585-8000  
(202) 585-8080 (Facsimile)